

REMARKS

The Specification has been amended to bring into conformance with the drawings. No claims have been amended. Claims 1-33 remain in the application.  
5 Further examination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, is hereby requested.

In Section 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84 (p)(5) because they include reference sign(s)  
10 not mentioned in the description. In response to this objection, Applicants have amended the specification as indicated above to correct missing reference designators and bring the specification into conformance with the drawings. In regard to reference characters 54, 58, 60, 62, 68 and 80 of Fig. 6, the Examiner is asked to review the following locations in the specification:

15 Page 2, lines 16-17: "Furthermore, like reference numerals designate corresponding similar parts through the several views." - In order to make the specification as succinct as possible, repetitious description of the various parts was avoided. Below is the location of the reference characters of Fig. 6 as  
20 described and similar to Fig. 3.

For control element 54 – See page 10, line 5.

For selected column line 58 – See page 11, line 11.

For non-selected column line 60 – See page 10, line 9.

For selected row 62 – See page 10, line 11.

25 For virtual ground 68 – See page 10, line 9.

For DAC 80 – See page 10, line 17.

Removal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

30 In Section 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3, 13, and 23 under 35 USC 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner stated that the feature as recited in claims 3, 13, and 23 is vague and indefinite since it is not described in the specification.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as the claim language is specifically described in the specification on page 14.

For instance, Claim 3 reads, "wherein the third voltage is equal to the second voltage." The third voltage being introduced in claim 2 as being selected before the sense circuitry detects the particular value of the electrical parameter. The second voltage is introduced in claim 1 as being selected when the sense circuitry detects the particular value of the electrical parameter. Page 14 line 18 states "a third voltage *such as the read voltage* is applied to the selected state-change device..." and page 14 lines 26-27 state "a second voltage, *preferably the read voltage* but alternatively a virtual ground or *other voltage lower than the programming voltage* is applied to the state change device." Thus, the third voltage and the second voltage may be equal such as both being the read voltage. Alternatively, to support the broader claim 2, the third voltage and the second voltage may also be different. Accordingly, Applicants believe that the claim language in claims 3, 13, and 23 is supported by the specification. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph is respectfully requested.


In Section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 1-2, 4-12, 14-22 and 24-33 were allowable. In Section 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 3, 13, and 23 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> Paragraph. Applicants believe that the specification supports the language of claims 3, 13, and 23 as discussed above and hence have not amended the claims at this time. The Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowance of these claims.

Applicants believe their claims are patentable over the art of record, and that the amendments made herein are within the scope of a search properly conducted under the provisions of MPEP 904.02. Accordingly, claims 1-33 are deemed to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the Application other than in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call Applicants' undersigned representative at the number listed below to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

5       The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-2025. Should such fees be associated with an extension of time, Applicants respectfully request that this paper be considered a petition therefore.

Hewlett-Packard Company  
Legal Department  
1000 NE Circle Blvd.  
Corvallis, OR 97330  
Telephone: (541)715-4197  
Fax: (541)715-8581  
tim.myers@hp.com

Respectfully Submitted,  
Andrew L. Van Brocklin et al.  
By:   
Timothy F. Myers  
Patent Attorney  
Registration No. 42,919